

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 19 and 22 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from the reference relied upon in the rejection discussed below. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 4 and the description thereof from the originally filed specification.

In addition, claim 20 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by O’Neil (U.S. 7,012,612). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 19 and 22 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 19 recites an apparatus for controlling a screen resource that is required to display a screen on a display. Further, claim 19 recites that the apparatus includes an instruction section that receives an instruction to switch a screen currently displayed on the display to another screen. Claim 19 also recites that the apparatus includes a screen control section that determines whether or not to discard the screen resource of the currently displayed screen when the currently displayed screen is switched to the another screen. Finally, claim 19 recites that, when (i) it is determined that the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by

the another screen, and (ii) an attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, the screen control section displays the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen. O’Neil fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as recited in amended independent claim 19.

Rather, O’Neil teaches determining whether or not to cache a new image when a new image is displayed, such that a previously cached image with a low quality rating is removed from images stored in the cache in order to try to make room for the new image in the cache (see Fig. 3, steps 300 and 306-312; and col. 7, lines 48-61). In addition, O’Neil teaches that the quality rating of the image is determined based on (i) a probability factor assigned to the class of the image, (ii) an amount of time since the image was last used, (iii) a number of times the image has been drawn onto a display, (iv) a size of the image, (v) a ratio of an area of a valid region of the image to an entire area of the image, and (vi) a ratio of an area of a constant region to an entire area of the image (see Fig. 9; and col. 10, lines 38-50).

Thus, in view of the above, even though O’Neil teaches determining a quality rating (which is used for determining whether to remove a low quality image from the cache) based on (i) a probability factor assigned to the class of the image, (ii) an amount of time since the image was last used, (iii) a number of times the image has been drawn onto a display, (iv) a size of the image, (v) a ratio of an area of a valid region of the image to an entire area of the image, and (vi) a ratio of an area of a constant region to an entire area of the image, O’Neil still fails to disclose or suggest that when it is determined that the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the another screen, and an attribute of the currently displayed screen indicates that the currently

displayed screen is in a resident state indicating that the screen resource of the currently displayed screen is to invariably remain in a generated state, the screen control section displays the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as recited in claim 19.

More specifically, even though O'Neil teaches that the quality rating of the image is determined based on factors (i)-(vi), O'Neil still fails to disclose or suggest that the attribute indicates that the screen resource of the displayed screen is to invariably remain in the generated state, as recited in claim 19.

Accordingly, although O'Neil teaches that the quality rating of the image is determined, O'Neil also fails to disclose or suggest that when the currently displayed screen is completely hidden by the another screen and when the screen resource of the displayed screen is to invariably remain in the generated state, the screen control section displays the another screen on the display without discarding the screen resource of the currently displayed screen, as recited in claim 19.

Furthermore, in view of the above, it is clear that O'Neil teaches determining whether the newly displayed image is to be stored in the cache and removing a previously cached image that has a low quality, but fails to disclose or suggest determining whether or not to discard the screen resource of the currently displayed screen when the currently displayed screen is switched to the another screen, as recited in claim 19.

In other words, O'Neil teaches determining whether or not to store the newly displayed image, which is completely different from determining whether or not to discard the screen resource of the screen when the screen is switched to another screen (i.e., when a new screen is displayed), as required by claim 19. Put another way, O'Neil teaches determining whether a new

image should be stored in cache, whereas claim 19 requires determining whether to discard the screen resource of the previously displayed screen when the new screen is displayed.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by O'Neil.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in O'Neil or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify O'Neil to obtain the invention of amended independent claim 19. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 22 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of amended independent claim 19. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 is allowable over the prior art of record.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken YAMASHITA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.04.05 14:33:37 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 5, 2010